BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. Welcome to the BC Membership call on the 26th of August, 2021 at 15:00 UTC. Today's meeting is recorded. Kindly state your name when speaking for the record. And have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom Participation. I've received apologies from Marie Pattullo and Barbara Wanner. And, Mason, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.
MASON COLE:	Thank you very much, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Good to have you all with us on this Thursday. We may have a lighter crowd today because there are lots of people on vacation but it looks like we have some critical mass for the meeting. So we're going to go ahead and proceed. The agenda is up on the screen Thank you, Brenda. Are there any updates or additions to the agenda that anybody would like to lodge at this point? Okay. Seeing no hands. All right. Then we will proceed.
	Item number two, policy discussion, as usual. And the policy calendar's up on the screen. Steve, over to you please.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks, Mason. Hey, everybody. Since our last call two weeks ago, we filed one public comment with ICANN. It was the 16th of August. Zak Muscovitch came through for us and drafted a short comment supporting .aero's sponsored TLD registry agreement renewal. Thank you again, Zak, for that.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

There are no significant open public comments right now that I have to seek volunteers for and that's a relief. But we are very busy with the NIS2 set of comments. And before I jump to that, I know that Mark Datysgeld needs to get off the call early. So I have promised Mark that we would go to the Council section first. So, Mark, I'm going to scroll down to the Council area and turn it over to you right now.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much. Thank you, everyone. Is my volume okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfect. Thank you.

MARK DATYSGELD: Everyone, two major topics during this particular meeting. The first one, I don't know. You might be as surprised as I am that this is still a thing. We have the Specific Curative Rights Protection for Intergovernmental Organizations, IGO. So if you remember this one, it's been kicking around, as far as I remember, as far back as 2018 or 2017. It went up for Board voting, which I thought had been the final destiny of this particular issue. But apparently, the Board hasn't voted on it yet and it was sent up to the Board in 2019.

The whole process has become rather confusing. And we got a presentation from staff summarizing it. Can't say it's exactly clear how they intend to move this ahead. What we know is that they will turn this now into an EPDP. Rather than keeping it as a discrete part of a different

process, this will be turned into an EPDP. And apparently, this is what will bring together the several moving parts of this particular question.

It is a little unclear. I'll be honest. We made several questions—several inquiries to the different staff members. I asked them a lot of questions as to are we going towards the direction in which this will actually get solved? Because there is literally three individual processes that need to be taken into account for this to come together.

According to them, we are. So there we go. That's a new EPDP which raises the question. Is all the PDP going to be an EPDP now? That's a serious question we have to ask ourselves now because, as you know, we have the main one. We also have the one for IDNs, which I am currently on, and we have this one. So what does an EPDP mean? Basically, it skips the issue report phase and jumps straight into the work. It seems like we are always having good excuses to go straight to that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Mark, let's give Jay Chapman, who's a BC member, who's on the call right now … He's on the work track and will be representing the BC on the EPDP. Jay, anything you want to add to what Mark said?

JAY CHAPMAN: Thanks, Steve, and Mark as well. This is a saga. It's just a saga that's been going on. I've known about this since about 2015 or '16 and some people say it goes back even further than that, as far as 2010. So the IGOs have been seeking their own RPM, rights protection mechanisms. And that was the previous … My report's attached. The two reports that

I've made are attached, if anybody really wants to dig into the weeds on this. But there were four recommendations from the previous IGO RPM Working Group. Actually, there were five. They were all consensus recommendations. The GNSO and the BC supported one through four. Five is now the reason why we are having this, previously work track, now EPDP.

So anyway, it's quite a deep conversation but I'd be happy to answer any questions or anything. But yes. I do believe, Mark, it will be resolved by the time we are done with this. I hope that helps.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Jay. Mark, back to you.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, Jay. It's sobering to hear that because looking at it from an external point of view, it does look rather convoluted. So we are very glad to have you supporting us on that one. And second point was about the CSC, the Customer Standing Committee, Effectiveness Review. There was a vote on that one in particular, with very specific action items. At this current point, I don't think there is much subject matter to be discussed on this particular issue.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Agreed. What do you think about what's coming up at the 23rd meeting?

MARK DATYSGELD: On the what, Steve? Sorry. I didn't catch that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Sorry, Mark. I was just asking you what do you think will be on the agenda for the next meeting, September the 23rd?

MARK DATYSGELD: So the EPDP IDNs has been moving at a rather strange pace right now. We are trying to get into the correct groove for that group. But it does involve every time zone on the planet. It's a difficult group to move forward. On top of that, Edmon Chung has just been elected to—who is the chair of that particular group—has been elected as ICANN Board member. So there's also a few—not necessarily problems but questions to be addressed in that sense. So I think that the IDNs EPDP will definitely need to look, in terms of what's going on over there.

So we'll keep you updated on that. It's not moving on the pace that it should be. And probably, the Council will need to have a bit of an update on that one. As far as I know, this is the most pressing thing that we are facing right now—the lack of a clear, concise start to this.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Mark. I'm looking in the participant list to see if anyone has any questions for our councilors. The EPDP for GDPR and WHOIS is going on right now. It finishes in 20 minutes. So, Mark Svancarek is on that call, representing us now. We had a call two days ago where I served as your alternate.

And I can tell you that I never have good news when I tell you about the EPDP on WHOIS and GDPR and I don't have good news today. It's shaping up to be a report that requires nothing. But it may actually add a field for registrant information, indicating whether their entity is a legal entity or a natural person and then, in addition, whether any of that registrant information contains personal data, in which case it would still have to be redacted, even if it were for a corporate or a legal entity. So that is not something that is likely to be resolved favorably to us. And the final report may well accompany a minority report from the BC, the IPC, ALAC, and GAC, which is similar to what happened in the previous phase.

Are there any questions on that Council item as well? Okay. Seeing none, Mark, anything further you want to add about Council?

MARK DATYSGELD: Not right now. Thank you, everyone. I'll be dropping for the call sooner than usual today. I have a lesson to give. But always looking forward to hearing any feedback so please reach out to me. Thank you, everyone.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Waudo, you're us next. And I have displayed on the screen the CSG report that you sent in last night after your call. Waudo, over to you.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you, Steve. Can you hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I do.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. Thank you for giving me the consideration to make my report a bit earlier. I have to leave to catch a train. The CSG held its first meeting yesterday—the first meeting after ICANN 71. I think that last substantive meeting we had was with the full Board as part of ICANN 71. So in yesterday's meeting, a number of things were discussed. I've listed them there. I think you can see them on the screen.

I'll just start off, maybe, with a little bit about the ICANN 72 planning, which, you know, the CSG usually is involved in a lot of planning for upcoming ICANN meetings. So this time, planning for ICANN 72 has started and we are already making proposals.

The first one is that we shall one and a half hour open CSG meeting. It will be a special meeting, where we intend to invite the CPH and the NCSG. They'll both share that slot of one and half hours, 45 minutes each.

For the CPH, we aim to discuss with them some of the issues arising from our priority list—if you can remember, the one we have been discussing in previous meetings—specifically compliance, as well as DNS abuse, although we have not been so … We have not had much success discussing with the CPH about DNS abuse. But we will hope to have it on the agenda during that meeting with them. So those are two elements from our priority list that we'll discuss with the CPH.

And then, with the NCSG, I think some of you may have heard that Paul McGrady of the IPC has been nominated—has been sent to represent the NCPH as the NomCom-appointed councilor. So we are inviting him to lead that presentation or that discussion with the NCPH during that CSG open meeting.

That is yet to be settled but it will most likely around the 3rd or the 4th of October. Once we have the exact date and timing, which of course will be Seattle timing, then we'll let you know about that so you can plan your participation in that CSG open meeting. Sometimes, it's known as the CSG Members Meeting. So interchange, that's possible.

The other thing is the CSG. I'm so sorry. I'll just switch off my phone. The next thing is about the CSG constituency. Chairs, I think we discussed this in the last BC meeting. There's a plan to have a meeting between the CSG chairs—the three of them—with the ICANN leadership, consisting of Göran, Maarten, Matthew, who is our representative on the Board, and David Olive. So this one is slated for September the 1st. And if you have anything that you'd like to be discussed in that meeting, maybe you can send it to Mason.

The objective of the meeting, as I have indicated, is to explore ways to improve CSG interactions with senior ICANN leadership. There has been a feeling in the recent past that our interactions with the senior membership have not been very productive. So that meeting hopes to find ways—explore ways to make such meetings more fruitful in future.

Then, the second last issue that we discussed regards the GNSO Council chair elections. You may recall we also discussed this issue at the last BC meeting. And I was requested to go out and do some interactions with

our other colleagues from there—the two constituencies—mainly Wolf-Ulrich and Heather, which I did. From the interactions with them, I ascertained—and also, it was ascertained in yesterday's meeting—that the three constituencies will basically support another term for Philippe, although, as I've indicated, a little bit of waiting on the part of the IPC. I think they still need to do some consultation within their constituency about that.

The other thing that we need to do, CSG, regarding those Council elections, is to organize a meeting with NCSG so that we can agree as a house, particularly not just on the election of the chair but also about a new VC. The previous VC was Catherine—has left and there's a new … I'm sorry. The current VC has been. I'm sorry. For this, the current VC has been Tatiana. She has been appointed as a ccNSO councilor by the NomCom. So that's a position that is going to be vacant and we'd love to discuss with the NCSG about who should fill that position. Anticipating that Philippe, who comes also from the same house, will be again elected as chair.

The last element that we discussed yesterday was on Work Stream 2. The CSG has received the recommendations. Those of you who are familiar with Work Stream 2 know that staff have worked out what is known as inventory for every constituency and also stakeholder group. So the CSG has received its recommendations and we are going to look through them to see exactly what it requires to be done—the recommendations from the Work Stream 2 that relate to the CSG. Some of them, for example, we may have to change some things in our charter. And as I've indicated, the itinerary for the CSG is a bit different from what will be done by the constituencies—in our case, the BC.

So thank you, Steve. That's the short report from the CSG as of today.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Waudo. Are there any questions, BC members, for your CSG representative? Thank you, Waudo. Seeing no questions, I'll return now to the policy calendar and give Drew Bennett, and Mason, and others, and Nick a chance to talk about our NIS2 work.

DREW BENNETT: Thanks, Steve. We are about a week away on this letter for members of the lead committee on European Parliament who are the final stages of the draft NIS2 and its amendments that will go to first reading within the next few months. As has been described on many occasions, there's been a ton of progress. We're quite pleased with the direction the European Parliament has been taking and their shared interests and values in the WHOIS system and the need for access.

So what we're suggesting now, in this letter, in terms of additional amendments are, in some respect, on the margins but also, um, very important, we see, in terms of preventing further cynical and other interpretations of the directive to avoid what we see as a clear intent for data of both legal and natural persons to be turned over in a timely manner to requestors when those requesters are legitimate access seekers.

So we've proposed … There's two options currently in the draft, or proposals for additional amendments that we see, that could help clarify that intent and solidify the requirement for that response from

legitimate access seekers—the response by registrars and registries, in this case. It should be pretty clear in the latest draft. Actually, I'm not sure it was in this version. Steve, I made some updates in the Google Doc last night.

There's an option one and an option two for two different approaches. One suggests adding a subparagraph to this article 23. Another suggests a change in recital. There's, I think, a pretty meaningful difference as to how the two—I guess, for the potential of their adoption and then the mechanics for how they would then impact the directive.

So I encourage folks to take a look at it. We've got a solid core team of the drafting group who are involved in the discussions about, for example, the strategy around this approach as to which amendments we're going to propose. I, in fact, will schedule another meeting—a Zoom—with the drafting team, probably Monday of next week. If you are not on the drafting team but are reviewing this Google Doc and want to be a part of that process and the last couple days of discussions to wrap things up and finalize our approach and some of the content, please e-mail me directly. I'm going to put my e-mail in the chat.

Our goal is to have the final version of the letter complete by Wednesday of next week to send to at least one of the shadow rapporteurs on the lead committee in the European Parliament.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Drew, thank you. I switched over to the Google Doc, away from the attached Word Doc, and that's what I'm showing in the screen, with both options. I put a link to that in the chat. The link to that document

EN

that Drew is speaking of is also in the policy calendar. It's the hyperlink on the word "circulated." Any questions or additional volunteers who want to get involved with the drafting of the NIS2 letter?

Great. So BC members have had it now for several days. And we're nearing the end of our seven-day review period so we'll try to narrow down the choices on these options and then give all the BC members a last call on the option that was selected, okay, Drew? So we'll just need to be able to give them all a day or two to react to the final selection.

DREW BENNETT: Yep. That's a good plan.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And BC members, I wanted to also alert you that on or about September 2nd, you're likely to also be asked to review a draft of the minority report that we would submit for the EPDP on WHOIS and GDPR. On the assumption we do a minority report, I want to give you seven days to review before it's due on the 10th of September. Any other questions for drew? Okay. I'll stop the sharing on my side and turn it back over to Mason. Thanks, all.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Steve. All right. It is 25 past the hour. We're doing very well on time today so let's return to the agenda. We're now on item number three. Well, let me just ask. Are there any follow-up questions for Steve or anyone who provided a report under our policy discussion?

Okay. No hands up. All right. Let's move to item number three, which is the Operations and Finance report. Lawrence, over to you, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Mason. And good day to everyone on today's call. Just pardon me for a minute. I'm trying to share my screen. Yes. I'm starting my report with an announcement from the ICANN community. There happens to have been published the result of an audit report on registrars' compliance with DNS abuse obligations. Oh. Okay. Sorry. Yes. Is it better now?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Can you go even louder, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Okay. So there happens to be an announcement of the report of an audit on the registrars' compliance with regards to DNS abuse obligations. This report can be found on the ICANN Org website. It happens to be an in-depth and interesting read, which members of the BC might find quite interesting and useful.

Secondly, with regards to outreach and membership, currently, work is ongoing on the BC Outreach Plan for FY22. So in each of the financial years, the BC puts together an outreach strategy. And I will be hosting a Google Document after the call, where the drafts that I have been working on will be posted. And I will also share a link on BC-private, asking members to make contributions towards the development of the outreach strategy for FY22. Outreach is presently a bit challenging

because of the virtual nature that we have found ourselves operating in. But I believe that with members' contribution, we might be able to come up with some creative ideas around how we can grow our numbers in the BC.

To this call, I will also be—like we have done before—soliciting for members to help with one-on-one outreach. In other words, if there are business—if there are contacts---if there are persons within your contacts, your sphere of influence, which you feel could bring value to the BC in terms of membership, we'll be happy to partner alongside existing BC members to reach out to such companies in the bid to having them become members of the BC.

Again, I share with us the stats on where we currently stand across all ICANN regions, in the different categories of membership that we have, just to help us have a better outlook of where we stand in terms of membership. We are definitely seeking more members from the Latin American and Caribbean Region, from Africa, from Asia Pacific. And then, Europe and North America are not doing too badly.

To this regard, the BC still maintains a membership strength of 63 different corporate entities across our three categories. We are hoping that by the end of FY22, which just started, we would have increased our membership strength to a large extent. This is why participation and gleaning ideas—rubbing minds together around how we can outreach to more companies, or rather, more potential members—will be very, very rewarding to the BC at this time.

I will also want to report that we have finalized work on the new BC logo. And in the days ahead, this will be showing up. This will be

replacing the old brand identity that we have on the BC's website. We'll also have our first attempt at showcasing this in our newsletter at the October meeting. Big thanks, many thanks to the ICANN team led by Carlos, Brenda, Chantelle that helped to work on the new BC logo. And from the BC side, thanks to Mark who helped to lead the initiative. We are really grateful and proud of our new look.

I want to announce that we have now opened a call for submission of articles for the ICANN 72 edition of the BC newsletter. We can now start putting together articles that are of interest and especially that will form great reads for the entire ICANN community.

Please. You don't have to wait for the timeline to last. Once you're through with such articles, you can send to myself or Brenda for passage to the BC's designer. We expect that by the 28th of September, we will have—which is more or less a month and a few days away from today—we should have all your articles. And from the 28th of September through to the 22nd of October, we will work behind the scenes to ensure that we have another wonderful newsletter just before ICANN 72 starts off on the 25th.

Please, if there is something you are interested in writing and you're not too sure of how to place it, you can always backchannel any of the ExCom members for advice and guidance. But articles are very welcome at this point in time.

I will come back to the BC accounts. Okay. Let me just take it right now. So, the ExCom has approved the proposed FY22 Budget estimates and FY21 Financial Report, shared with members at our last meeting. I want to appreciate the efforts of everyone on the ExCom for carefully

scrutinizing the draft budget estimates, the Finance Committee for their inputs and their edits made, and members also for all your varied contributions towards that document. With this done, and with ExCom's approval, we have now started the process of filing the FY21 Financial Report with the tax authorities in order to stay compliant.

The BC's reserve fund is also still pegged at $60,000. And hopefully, we will be growing this to about $80,000 by the end of FY22. This is because we still anticipate that there are some budget heads that might not be spent. For example, ICANN 72 remains virtual. So funds that should ordinarily go to the four officers' travel, to outreach, and other commitments that were budgeted for will be saved. All this will definitely help to impact an increase in the reserve funds.

We had a presentation from IGFSA that was made by Dr. Jimson Olufuye about three, four meetings back. ExCom had approved a donation of $2,500 to support the IGF through the IGFSA. And this also goes a long way to enhance our posture as a not-for-profit entity. As a not-for-profit entity, it is expected—especially one registered in the United States—it is expected that we will make contributions and donations for social causes. So this definitely helps to keep us in compliance with our not-for-profit nature.

So at this point, I want to pause before going on, just in case anyone has a question, or concern, or a feedback to provide with regards to the FY22 Budget preparation, the process, and what's been approved so far. I'm monitoring the chat also, just in case anyone has something that they would want to share. I will come back to that.

Okay. So going ahead, FY22 invoices and bills. All companies will have received invoices. And those who have yet to pay will have received multiple reminders. We have close to 18 companies that we are still expecting to renew their dues for FY22. Please note that only financially-up-to-date members of the BC will be able to vote and be voted for during elections. And we have elections around the corner. So it is a very, very good time to have your company become financially compliant and up-to-date.

So if you are not sure of your level of compliance, you can kindly send an e-mail to invoice@icannbc.org. And for anyone who is having one or two challenges or has some requirements that they want us to meet to be able to fulfill their payments, we are trying to close out every such request and we would appreciate if we can quickly have any outstanding issues resolved. Please reach out to myself or invoice@icannbc if you need help fulfilling your invoices and dues.

So right now, the BC election is around the corner. We will be starting off with the election of BC officers. The BC officers are the chair, the vice-chair for finance and operations, the vice-chair for policy, and the CSG rep. Already, the elections from councilors have been conducted. And the names of the successful candidate has also been sent to ICANN for processing and recognition. So this election is for four of the offices that will fall due.

The nomination period is going to be from the 6th of September to the 20th of September, as the BC charter provides for two weeks for a nomination period. This is the last call before. By the next call, definitely, we will have started the process of filling nominations for these roles. So

on the 6th September is the date to mark in our calendars, in case we are interested in any of the four officer roles.

I will kindly note again that aside from yourself being compliant, we shall also try to ensure that those who might be nominating members for any of these offices are also financially up-to-date. Candidate statements will be expected to be provided to ICANN, to BC-private—sorry—bc-private@icann.org by the 21st of September, which is a Tuesday. We will have a candidates call on the 23rd of September and voting will start on Friday the 24th, through to Thursday, the 30th of September.

I want us to note that in line with the BC charter, section two, that happens to deal with elections, also specifically states that officers can stay in office concurrently for a term of three years but not more than five years, except if there is no other officer stepping forward to fill any of those positions. So based on that, every current officer of the BC that we have today are eligible for another term of office as long as they have not maxed five years max in that particular position or three years, which is the initial period they are restated in the charter. But by interpretation, because this process—because the charter came into force in the year 2017, all current officers of the BC are eligible for another term.

But we invite every member of the BC who is interested to step forward for any of these positions. If you are also interested, as has been the norm over the years, you could also kindly reach out to the officer there to ask for information as to what the requirements and the duties of

those roles entail, so much so to be able to understand what is needed to function effectively in these roles.

Right after the election is concluded on the 30th of September, the outcome and the results will be announced on the 1st of October, which happens to be the Independence Day for Nigeria. So the new officers will take their seats on the 1st of January, 2022. Pardon me, please. This is 2022 that you'll be here.

For the BC committees, the election into BC committees will kick off right after ICANN 72 and nominations will open for two weeks, also, from the 1st of November to the 15th of November. All the committees—Finance, Credentials, Communications, and Onboarding committees—requirement additional volunteers. Some of these committees will have two to probably three vacancies existing. More information will be shared on the BC-private list with regards to the current composition of all the committees and the numbers that are due in the forthcoming elections. All current members except for those who might be term-limited are definitely due for reelection.

The interested candidates will have to provide candidate statement by Tuesday, the 16th of November. We will have a candidates call for committees on the 18th of November and elections will start immediately of Friday, the 19th of November, through to the 24th. By the 29th of November, we will make an announcement on the outcomes of the election and the new volunteers will take their seats by the first of January, 2022.

In the month of October, we will be hosting the ICANN 72 meeting. And for that purpose, we have a little adjustment to the dates that were

earlier scheduled for October meetings. So in October 2021, due to the ICANN 72 meeting, we will have our usual BC call on the 7th of October. That will be the first call as previously scheduled, on the 7th of October.

Thereafter, we have readjusted the date for our meeting and will have a closed meeting on the 21st of October. This is close to the ICANN week so that we are able to have some further discussions around the meetings and discussions that will be taking place at ICANN 72. On the 26th of October, we will have an open BC meeting, which falls within the ICANN week. And I'm sure our chair will have more details to share in this regard.

At this point, I will yield the floor back to Mason, our chair. Thanks very much. If there are any questions for me, I will also stand by to take them. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. Excellent report. Are there any questions or follow-ups for Lawrence before we move forward on the agenda? All right. No hands in the queue and nothing in the chat. All right, Lawrence. Thank you very much for that report. All right, ladies and gentlemen. We are now at item number four on the agenda and we have 15 minutes to go so we're slightly ahead on time. We have issues for BC discussion and AOB.

Before we dive into item four, let me just add as an item under item number for a quick report on a call that we had with Göran Marby, the ICANN CEO earlier this week. This happens from time to time, where constituency leadership is invited to have an informal discussion and

with David Olive, who's the VP of policy development for ICANN. And we had about a 45-minute session. Lawrence attended and normally Steve is involved in that conversation as well, although Steve was traveling so Mark Svancarek filled in for Steve. I just wanted to report on some outcomes from that call and give you a heads up about what may happen next.

So there were three issues that were covered. One was raised by Lawrence and that had to do with a return to in-person meetings for ICANN. As you might guess, this is up in the air. Göran reported that, given the state of developments with COVID in the world and the relative lack of vaccination in some places around the world, that he's not sure—and nobody, really, at ICANN is sure yet—when we will return to full-time in-person meetings.

Everybody hopes that that's fairly soon. ICANN emphasized that they need to do this safely. Naturally, we agree with that. But that discussion was conducted and the future of ICANN meetings is up in the air for now. But hopefully, we'll hear something from ICANN in the near future on what to expect for meetings for 2022.

We also raised the issue of the Operational Design Phase or ODP that is currently underway as part of the … It's parallel, really, to the EPDP on WHOIS policy. The ODP specifically focuses on the System for Standardized Access and Disclosure for Registration Data. And our interest here was to take some measure of the ODP's impact on policy development for the SSAD.

ICANN's take, as you might expect, was that this is a useful and necessary step for ICANN. It'll pay dividends down the line in saved

time, saved work, saved money. We professed a little bit of skepticism on this but overall, that discussion was fairly non-committal. ICANN insists that the ODP is a useful step and one that is going to help inform the Board on what to expect in terms of costs and developments for the SSAD. So that process is still early. There are still lots of kinks to be worked out. So you should expect to see some developments on that soon.

A corollary to this as well, the conversation then moved on its own into a discussion on the BC's position within ICANN and the CSG's position within ICANN. We were honest with Göran and David about our sometimes frustration over lack of progress on positions that the BC and the CSG take within ICANN and some objectives that remain unfulfilled on the part of the CSG and the feeling that, sometimes, the BC's positions are a box to be checked by ICANN—not that we're outright ignored but that our opinions or our input don't carry as much weight, say, as Contracted Parties do, or the GAC, or others.

So we started down that road with a collegial but frank conversation. The result from that was that … Naturally, ICANN said that they don't play favorites and everybody's opinion is equally-weighted. Personally, I'm not sure about that. But nonetheless, that was where we took the conversation.

Göran offered, as a follow-up to that, to attend a BC meeting for an informal conversation with BC members about issues of importance to us. And this could be a helpful and productive session to have. So it is our intention, on the ExCom, to invite Göran to a future meeting, probably in September, where he will be our guest. And we'll devote

most of the meeting to an informal conversation with him about issues that are important to the BC and how we can continue to advance those within the ICANN arena.

Then finally, we talked about—again, corollary to that point, the interactions between Non-Contracted Party House and ICANN as a whole. And it was raised that sometimes these are tense or adversarial exchanges between Non-Contracted Parties and ICANN Org. And this is part of the impetus that led to the meeting that was talked about earlier in the call, on September 1st, when we'll have a discussion with Göran, David Olive, Matthew Shears, and Maarten Botterman of the ICANN Board.

We're looking forward to that meeting because it's an opportunity to clear the air a bit and talk, again, about BC priorities and about how to more productively work with ICANN so that BC and CSG priorities are advanced. So we're looking forward to that discussion. If you have input on what should be raised in that discussion, the ExCom is all ears. I encourage you to e-mail me, or anybody else in the ExCom for that matter, with issues that you'd like to raise for us to bring to that meeting.

So I just wanted to report on that and let everybody know the outcomes of that meeting Lawrence, do you have anything you'd like to add? You were at that meeting and you may have some additional color to add.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Nothing to add, other than all that you have said. But it was a bit more productive than I had envisaged because, to a large extent, we had

made up our minds not to dwell too much on issues that have been quite touchy in the past. I see Göran's invitation to speak to us in a more informal kind of environment as an extension of a desire to try and court more cooperation from business. Basically, it appears that feedback that they've had, that there needs to be better cooperation amongst business or the BC, particularly, might be at the core of why they are having that kind of a disposition.

So by the time he gets to meet with us, as the BC, we might be able to make up our minds better. But I'm hopeful that we might, for some reasons, now begin to have a listening org, more or less. But aside the other issues, there wasn't so much time to take other issues that we had on the table. But I think it was a very good meeting compared to others that we've had in the past. Thank you, chair, for giving me the opportunity to make this input.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. Appreciate that very much. So if members have questions about the outcome of that meeting or about what we'd like to see raised in our discussion with Göran, certainly contact me, or Lawrence, or any member of the ExCom offline.

All right. There's six minutes left in the meeting time. Are there any other issues to be raised for BC discussion today? Or is there any other business to be raised? I see no … Oh. Toba, please go ahead.

TOBA OBANIY: Thank you so much, Mason, for giving me the floor. I'm still getting familiar with BC so forgive me if I'm not following the right protocols.

Earlier on this year, I think I was nominated to be part of—I think the Abuse Committee and the Communications Committee. I'm not sure if got that right. But asides one meeting I missed because of a conflict, there hasn't been a lot—or I haven't seen anything regarding either. And I'm not sure if I'm the one missing out details or there hasn't been any conversation or meetings. So I just wanted to get some clarification on that.

And also, I think I am also supposed to be part of the scoping team on behalf of BC. But not much has happened since the discussion about [inaudible] meetings two meetings ago. So I'm just a bit lost about what I'm supposed to do and what's next. So that's my question, really. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Toba, for raising that. I believe on the Accuracy Scoping Team, nothing has taken place just yet. So I believe you're all right there. Susan Kawaguchi is on the call. Or he was. Never mind. I was going to say she's the other person on the Scoping Team so perhaps she could shed some light. But if you like, Toba, just send me a note over e-mail and I'll help you clarify that. Lawrence may be able to give you some more color on the committees. Lawrence, could you help Toba out here?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. Thank you, Mason. And thanks, Toba, for that wonderful question. I believe that … You basically volunteered for the BC's DNS Abuse Working Party. There have been a number of e-mail exchanges on the working party—on the working group. And I'm sure that you should be

on that e-mail list. There have been discussions. I think the last, if I recall, was the registrar audit that was shared by Mason in the course of this week. So I would definitely check to see if you are on the mailing list. But if there's any issue, I'm sure Brenda will help with that.

We don't have much going on yet on the Communications Committee. So that would account for the reason why there hasn't been a number of discussions in that-wise. But again. Thank you for this prompt. I will take it up with Yusuph to see how we can get things going.

For the Scoping Team, I'm sure they are still in the process of getting the work properly started. But once it does kick off, I'm sure that you will definitely have a lot on your hands, especially as the BC rep. But I will definitely check to be sure that you are on the BC's DNS Abuse Working Party. And if not, I apologize. Thanks a lot.

TOBA OBANIYI: Thank you so much, Lawrence. It's also possible that maybe I may have missed those e-mails. I will also check from my end. Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Lawrence. And thank you, Toba, for raising that. Much appreciated. Any other business to be raised today? All right. I see no hands and the chat is clear. So I'll remind BC members. We have our next meeting on Thursday, the 9th of September at your regular. And if

EN

there's no other business, then, ladies and gentlemen, the BC stands adjourned. Thank you very much.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you all very much. [This adjourns] the meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]